

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested. Claims 16-27 are in this application. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled. Claims 16-27 have been added to alternatively claim the present invention.

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 15 due to a number of informalities. As noted above, claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 8-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Ker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030147190). The Examiner also rejected claims 1-4, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chang (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,540). The Examiner further rejected claims 5-11 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang. As noted above, claims 1-15 have been cancelled.

With respect to new claim 16, this claim recites:

“a pad;
“a to-be-protected circuit connected to the pad;
“a MOS transistor having a drain, a source, and a gate; and
“an npn bipolar junction transistor having a collector connected to the pad, an emitter connected to a ground line, and a base connected to the drain, only a single drain being connected to the base.”

Thus, new claim 16 recites that only a single drain is connected to the base of the bipolar junction transistor.

With respect to the Ker reference, if the MOS transistor Mn shown in FIG. 6 of Ker is read to be the MOS transistor required by claim 16, then bipolar junction transistor Q1 shown in FIG. 6 of Ker can not be read to be the bipolar junction transistor required by claim 16. This is because FIG. 6 of Ker shows that the base of bipolar junction transistor Q1 is connected to the drains of two transistors, PMOS transistor Mp and NMOS transistor Mn.

Thus, since the Ker reference does not teach a bipolar junction transistor where only a single drain is connected to the base, new claim 16 is not anticipated by the Ker reference. In addition, since claims 17-21 depend either directly or indirectly claim 16, claims 17-21 are not anticipated by Ker for the same reasons as claim 16.

With respect to the Chang reference, bipolar junction transistor B3 shown in FIG. 5 of Chang can not be read to be the bipolar junction transistor required by claim 16 because bipolar junction transistor B3 is a pnp transistor. Thus, since FIG. 5 of the Chang reference does not teach or suggest an npn bipolar junction transistor, new claim 16 is patentable over the Chang reference. In addition, since claims 17-21 depend either directly or indirectly claim 16, claims 17-21 are patentable over Chang for the same reasons as claim 16.

With respect to new claim 22, this claim recites:

"a pad;
"a to-be-protected circuit connected to the pad;
"an NMOS transistor having a drain, a source, and a gate; and
"an npn bipolar junction transistor having a collector connected to the pad, an emitter connected to a ground line, and a base connected to the drain, no PMOS transistor being connected to the base."

Thus, new claim 22 recites that no PMOS transistor is connected to the base of the bipolar junction transistor.

With respect to the Ker reference, the bipolar junction transistor Q1 shown in FIG. 6 of Ker can not be read to be the bipolar junction transistor required by claim 16. This is because FIG. 6 of Ker shows that the base of bipolar junction transistor Q1 is connected to the drain of PMOS transistor Mp. Thus, since the Ker reference does not teach a bipolar junction transistor where the base is not connected to a PMOS, new claim 22 is not anticipated by the Ker reference. In addition, since claims 23-27 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 22, claims 23-27 are not anticipated by Ker for the same reasons as claim 22.

With respect to the Chang reference, bipolar junction transistor B3 shown in FIG. 5 of Chang can not be read to be the bipolar junction transistor required by claim 22 because bipolar junction transistor B3 is a pnp transistor. Thus, since FIG. 5 of the Chang reference does not teach an npn bipolar junction transistor, new claim 22 is patentable over the Chang reference. In addition, since claims 23-27 depend either directly or indirectly claim 22, claims 23-27 are patentable over Chang for the same reasons as claim 22.

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-17-05

By: Mark C. Pickering

Mark C. Pickering
Registration No. 36,239
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300
Telephone: (707) 762-5500
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504
Customer No. 33402